



PATENT APPLICATION

6/26/03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Livia POLANYI et al.

Group Art Unit: 2697

Application No.: 09/609,325

Examiner: T. Lowe

Filed: June 30, 2000

Docket No.: 106142

For: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR TEACHING WRITING USING MICROANALYSIS
OF TEXT

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

RECEIVED

Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Washington, D.C. 20231

MAY 20 2003

Technology Center 2600

Sir:

In reply to the February 28, 2003 Office Action and the personal interview held April 22, 2003, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Claims 1-24 are pending.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Office Action's indication that claims 14, 15, 19 and 21 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, Applicants submit that each of claims 1-24 are allowable for the following reasons.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to their representative, Mr. Collier, by Examiners Lowe and Dorvil during the April 22 personal interview. The reasons presented during the April 22 personal interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 8, 9, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent 6,112,168 to Corston et al. (hereinafter "Corston"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed upon during the April 22 personal interview, Corston fails to teach or describe a step of "selecting a theory of discourse analysis for teaching writing." Only one theory of discourse analysis is taught or described in Corston. Specifically, Corston disclosed using only the Discourse Structures Theory (see e.g., col. 4, lines 17-26; col. 4, lines 27-29; col. 4, lines 32-42; col. 4, lines 43-55 col. 26, lines 14-20; col. 26, lines 44-49; and claims 1, 12, 19, and 28). Because Corston discloses only the Discourse Structure Theory, Corston nowhere teaches or describes the selection of, or the use of, a theory of discourse analysis other than Discourse Structures Theory.

Because Corston does not teach or describe a method for teach expository writing comprising "selecting a theory of discourse analysis for teaching writing," Corston cannot anticipate claims 1-3, 8, 9, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

On page 4 of the Office Action, claims 4-7, 10, 11, 16-18, 20 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Corston in view of U.S. Patent 5,642,520 to Takeshita et al. (hereinafter "Takeshita"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claims 4-6, 10 and 11, the rejection is premised upon the assumption that Corston teaches every feature of claim 1. Because, as discussed above, Corston does not teach the "selecting a theory of discourse analysis for teaching writing," the combination of Corston and Takeshita described on pages 4-6 of the Office Action cannot render claims 4-6, 10 and 11 obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

With respect to claims 16-18, 20 and 22-24, the rejection is premised upon the assumption that Corston discloses a controller that selects a theory of discourse from the

input device. Because, as discussed above, Corston only teaches and describes using a single theory of discourse, Corston cannot, and does not, disclose a controller that selects a theory of discourse from the input device.

Because Corston does not teach or describe "a controller that selects a theory of discourse from the input device," the combination of Takeshita and Corston described on pages 6 and 7 of the Office Action cannot render claims 16-18, 20 and 22-24 obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-24 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jesse O. Collier
Registration No. 53,839

JAO:JOC/tea

Date: May 19, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--